

STATEMENT OF PROCEEDINGS FOR THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY COMMISSION FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES HELD IN ROOM 739

OF THE KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION 500 WEST TEMPLE STREET, LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012

Monday, May 16, 2011 10:00 AM

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Curry, Vice Chair Olivas, Vice Chair Savelle, Commissioner

Berger, Commissioner Biondi, Commissioner Franzen,

Commissioner Rudnick, Commissioner Sorkin and Commissioner

Trevino-Powell

Excused: Vice Chair Friedman, Commissioner Kang, Commissioner

Kleinberg, Commissioner McClanev, Commissioner Murray and

Commissioner Williams

I. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

1. Call to order. (11-2256)

The meeting was called to order by Chair Curry at 10:08 a.m.

2. Introduction of May 16, 2011, meeting attendees. (11-2257)

Self-introductions were made.

3. Approval of the Agenda of May 16, 2011. (11-2258)

On motion of Commissioner Savelle, seconded by Commissioner Rudnick (Commissioners, Kang, Kleinberg, McClaney, Murray Olivas, and Williams being absent), the agenda for May 16, 2011, was unanimously approved.

4. Approval of the Minutes from April 18, 2011. (11-2024)

On motion of Commissioner Savelle, seconded by Commissioner Biondi (Commissioners, Kang, Kleinberg, McClaney, Murray, Olivas, and Williams being absent), the minutes for April 18, 2011, were unanimously approved.



Attachments: SUPPORTING DOCUMENT

5. Approval of the Minutes for May 2, 2011. (11-2259)

On motion of Commissioner Trevino-Powell, seconded by Commissioner Biondi (Commissioners, Kang, Kleinberg, McClaney, Murray, Olivas and Williams being absent), the minutes for May 2, 2011, were unanimously approved.

<u>Attachments:</u> <u>SUPPORTING DOCUMENT</u>

II. REPORTS

6. Chair's Report by Patricia Curry, Chair, for May 16, 2011. (11-2260)

Chair Curry reported that the Department of Children and Families Services (DCFS) and the Probation Department have invited the Commission to participate in the planning of the System Improvement Plan (SIP). The SIP event will take place on June 2, 2011 from 2 p.m. - 5 p.m. at the Doubletree Hotel in Norwalk, CA. RSVPs by Commissioners are due by Friday, May 20, 2011. Commissioners may contact Commission staff to RSVP.

Chair Curry's verbal report was received and filed.

- **7.** DCFS Acting Director's Report by Dr. Jackie Contreras, Acting Interim Director, DCFS. (11-2261)
 - Dr. Contreras reported the following:
 - On Tuesday, May 17, 2011, the Board of Supervisors (Board) will vote on an item to move DCFS and the Probation Department under the direct supervision of the Board (Agenda No. 57). The Department of Human Resources will now begin conducting a search for a permanent Director for DCFS.
 - DCFS requested 26 administrative positions during the last budget cycle. However, since then, DCFS has filled those positions internally with existing budgeted positions. The administrative positions will enhance internal controls, the Back to Work section, Property Management, and assist with the creation of the Senate Bill 39 Unit. Consequently, DCFS does not anticipate any further requests to add positions.
 - DCFS currently has 1,619 Emergency Referrals (ER) over sixty days and anticipates having all ER cases eliminated by the end of June 2011.



- DCFS has been awarded a Federal Permanency Grant. Pending Board approval, the grant awards DCFS approximately \$500,000 for the 2011 planning year with approximately \$1 million each subsequent year, for four years. The intent of the grant is to achieve permanency for youth who traditionally emancipate out of the system, particularly for African American youth who are disportionately represented in the child welfare system. Pomona, Torrance and the Wateridge offices will be the first to participate in programs funded by the grant; however, DCFS anticipates expanding programs to all DCFS offices.
- DCFS is enhancing the Emergency Response processes for youth being assessed as a danger to themselves and others. The Department is working in collaboration with the Department of Mental Health (DMH) to assess youth on the front-end, and has reassigned existing vacant positions to staff the hotline.

In response to questions posed by the Commission, Dr. Contreras added the following:

- Katie A. provides mental health services primarily to children; however, Katie A. currently does not assess parents' mental health.
- Whether the Board votes to move DCFS and the Probation Department under its direct supervision, at present DCFS will continue to work in collaboration with the Chief Executive Office (CEO) and other County departments.
- Dr. Contreras' verbal report was received and filed.

III. PRESENTATIONS

8. Presentation by Serita Cox, iFoster Organization. (11-2262)

Ms. Cox reported provided an overview of iFoster and reported the following:

 iFoster was founded six months ago (launched in October 2010) and is a free members-only community for transition age youth, caregivers, and support organizations in foster care. iFoster programs strive to improve stability, permanency, and outcomes for children, youth and families through concepts that:



<u>Stabilize</u> – Close the funding gap through discounts, group buying, and community trading

<u>Strengthen</u> – Enable community sharing and learning from trusted resources

Empower – Foster collective voice on key issues important to the community.

In response to questions posed by the Commission Ms. Cox added the following:

- iFoster services were initially intended to be a pilot program; thus only a few agencies were notified of its existence. However, word of mouth spread quickly after launching the iFoster website; iFoster was compelled to continue and expand the service. The New York Department of Health and Human Services placed iFoster brochures within the checks mailed to caregiving families; the Dave Thomas Foundation posted iFoster on their blogs and Casey Family Programs has informed all of their families. Although the primary means of informing families and agencies about iFoster has been via the internet, iFoster is open to any suggestions that may increase exposure. Additionally iFoster has discovered that case workers are great advocates and have contributed to the dissemination of iFoster information.
- Most of the coupons offered by iFoster online are printable. iFoster is exploring alternatives on providing its coupons in an easy and offline manner.
- Qualified users interested in signing up with iFoster are required to complete a registration form which collects information such as the agency that the user is affiliated with. In addition, iFoster requires that users complete a release form so that information provided by the user can be verified with the agencies users are affiliated with. As iFoster continues to grow and offers discounts for varies products such as laptops and computers, a more intensive review of users will be conducted.
- iFoster is currently self-funded and foundation funded. Over the next three years, iFoster would like to be more corporate funded, but not solely Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) funded. iFoster is currently in discussions with Dell on the feasibility of obtaining discounted computers for its members. If Dell is able to demonstrate that discounts they offer to iFoster users are increasing their revenue other corporations will most likely be interested in participating due to the volume of customers iFoster generates.



- iFoster has the ability to track coupons that are downloaded from the iFoster website; however, it currently does not know when the coupon is used. iFoster plans to use such data to demonstrate the revenue it is generating for participating corporations.
- foster recently received a grant from the S. D. Bechtel, Jr.
 Foundation, and is currently in dialogue with the Draper Richards
 Kaplan Foundation, and the Walter S. Johnson Foundation to explore
 the feasibility of securing grants from these organizations.
- Currently, foster has members from the Los Angeles area.

The Commission suggested the following organization's websites that could be linked to iFoster's website:

- (The Independent Living Program) <u>www.ilponline.org</u>
- (The Association of Community Human Service Agencies)
 www.achsa.net
- (The Children's Law Center of Los Angeles)
 www.clcla.org/indexmain.htm
- (Grandparents as Parents) <u>www.grandparentsasparents.org</u>
- (Children's Action Network) <u>www.childrensactionnetwork.org</u>
- (United Friends of the Children) <u>www.unitedfriends.org</u>
- (Los Angeles County 211) www.211losangeles.org
- iFoster has begun discussions with the University of California Berkley and some of the other universities that have guardian programs. iFoster would like to go beyond discounts and improve access of youth to colleges and universities.
- iFoster realizes that transportation is important for transition age youth and their families and does have discounts for gas and automotive parts and repairs; other forms of discounts will be forthcoming.

After discussion, Ms. Cox's presentation was received and filed.

Attachments: SUPPORTING DOCUMENT SUPPORTING DOCUMENT

9. Presentation by Dr. Michael Rauso, Division Chief, DCFS, on the Wraparound Program. (11-2269)



Dr. Rauso reported the following:

- The Wraparound Program (Wraparound) began in 1998 as a pilot project with services for 10 children. Currently, DCFS has over 2,000 children in Wraparound with 34 provider agencies located throughout Los Angeles County.
- Wraparound would like to fill 4,200 slots, with a combination of Tier I and Tier II slots. The ideal number of slots for Wraparound is 1,400 for Tier I and 2,800 slots for Tier II. It is anticipated that Wraparound number of slots will double in size in the next two to three years. Wraparound has been targeting younger youth in group homes; to date the youngest child serviced is six years old.
- Wraparound has experienced an increase in the Tier II population which indicates that families are taking advantage of Wraparound services. Consequently, the increase in Tier II is affecting Tier I enrollment due to early intervention of children; children are not necessarily transitioning to the higher group homes when intervened. Wraparound is focusing on providing more intensive in-home mental health services.
- A recent study revealed that of the 52 youth who received Wraparound, only seven had placements compared to the non-Wraparound 52 youth who had 249 placements. Additionally, a precomparative analysis revealed that the two 52 youth groups were virtually identical.
- In 2007, a study was conducted with two groups of 52 youth. One group received Wraparound and the other 52 youth received the regular Rate Classification Level (RCL) 12 and above. The children who participated in this study were tracked for two and half years after they graduated or were discharged from the group home. Results of the study revealed that the youth that only three children remained in the DCFS' system that received Wraparound versus 42 children who received regular RCL services. A financial analysis was also conducted to demonstrate that Wraparound, which is often perceived as expensive, is actually less expensive than residential care.
- A subsequent study on Wraparound was conducted with the aid of DCFS researchers to further provide tangible outcomes for Wraparound. The use of DCFS researchers ensured that the study was appropriate and would be accepted by the scientific publications in the community. The second study drew a large population for the

study but essentially replicated the original study by comparing a group of youth who received Wraparound services versus a control group that were RCL 12 + group homes. The study included youth under the ages of 17 and those youth with six months of residential or Wraparound services. The Wraparound group consisted of 102 youth and the residential group was comprised of 2010 youth. These youth were tracked for 12 months, and the study revealed that the Wraparound group was four times as likely to have their cases closed within 12 months.

• In 2004, DCFS started the Resiwrap Pilot Project which combined Residential with Wraparound. This pilot project was very successful; unfortunately, due to funding restrictions the project was not continued. However, in 2006, legislation was passed that allowed residentially based pilot and four counties participated in the pilot; Los Angeles, San Bernardino, San Francisco and Sacramento. The pilot was a two-year demonstration project that began in December 2010. The pilot provided Wraparound services to youth who were in residential care. In Los Angeles County, there are three provider agencies participating in the pilot project that will serve approximately 160 youth over the two years. Currently, 56 youth are receiving Wraparound while in residential care, and one youth has already graduated or exited residential and was adopted.

In response to questions posed by the Commission Dr. Rauso added the following:

- Probation youth are only included in the Tier I numbers. As part of the Katie A. settlement, Wraparound was expanded to include a larger population. Tier II is specifically for DCFS youth. Tier II is paid a lower case rate mainly because the children in Tier II have more informal support than the children in Tier I.
- Wraparound Tier I, providers receive \$4,184 per month per child with placements cost deducted from that amount.
- A majority of the youth that participated in the Wraparound study were Hispanic, followed by African American. The RCL control group was primarily African American, followed by Hispanic. The study also took into consideration youth that were seventeen who participated in Wraparound.

- The data from the two Wraparound studies were published in a national journal which is being used as research article. Additionally, to be considered an evidence based practice, there have to be a number published research articles. DCFS has been asked to conduct another study and follow the youth for a longer period. The majority of evidence-based practices focus on a small population, but Wraparound accepts any youth. Stories from the Wraparound study are included within the research article.
- There are several reasons why Wraparound has not been expanded, one of them being, getting the word out about Wraparound. DCFS social workers may not fully understand the differences among the many programs available to them. DCFS has discovered that the same social workers that are using Wraparound are the majority who continue to refer youth to Wraparound. DCFS is conducting outreach to inform social workers, and increasing marketing efforts for Wraparound. In addition, Wraparound is graduating youth quickly; the average length of stay is only 15 months.
- Wraparound publishes an annual report every year and the Commission will be provided a copy upon request.
- DCFS engages all providers who are not performing at level expected of them. The dialogue between DCFS and the provider focuses on areas of improvement similar to the Quality Service Review (QSR) process. DCFS speaks the social workers, families and staff to determine how the provider can resolve problems and provide the level of service that is expected of them. Additionally, there is a Wraparound hotline which allows anyone to call in and voice concerns about a particular provider agency. DCFS is also implementing a Wraparound scorecard to rate the individual Wraparound providers.
- Wraparound is a part of the Title IV-E Waiver (Waiver) capped allocation; however, only Tier I is funded by the Waiver. Tier II is a part of the Katie A settlement, and is funded by a combination of net County funds and Mental Health Services Act (MHSA) funds. The Waiver funds are not reinvestment dollars.
- Wraparound providers are contractually obligated to review any medication that the youth is taking with a Psychiatrist. DCFS must ensure that the medication is appropriate and administered appropriately, not only while the youth is in the system, but when they exit the system. Wraparound works well because it incorporated a team approach.



Dr. Contreras added that DCFS has a meeting scheduled with Probation to discuss Wraparound services, and that DCFS is currently reviewing a new process for Request for Proposals (RFP) for Wraparound providers.

After discussion, Dr. Rauso's presentation was received and filed.

IV. COMMITTEE/WORKGROUP UPDATES

10. Update on the Faith-Based Committee by Ann Franzen, Committee Chair. (11-1232)

This item was continued to the meeting of June 6, 2011.

- 11. Childcare Policy Roundtable Update
 - Ann Franzen, Commission Representative (11-2270)

This item was continued to the meeting of June 6, 2011.

V. MISCELLANEOUS

Matters Not Posted.

12. Matters not on the posted agenda, to be discussed and (if requested) placed on the agenda for action at a future meeting of the Commission, or matters requiring immediate action because of an emergency situation or where the need to take action arose subsequent to the posting of the agenda. (11-2271)

There were none.

Public Comment

13. Opportunity for members of the public to address the Commission on items of interest that are within the jurisdiction of the Commission. (11-2272)

No members of the public addressed the Commission.

VI. ANNOUNCEMENTS

14. Announcements for the meeting of May 16, 2011. (11-2275)

There were none.

Adjournment

15. Adjournment for the meeting of May 16, 2011. (11-2273)

The meeting was adjourned at 11:51 a.m.

